

REMARKS

This response is to the Office Letter mailed in the above-referenced case on December 01, 2005. Claims 1-10 are standing for examination. The Examiner objects to claims 1-10 for informalities. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (U.S. 5,727,159) hereinafter Kikinis in view of Banerjee (U.S. 6,292,181) hereinafter Banerjee. Claims 1-10 are also rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-10 of U.S. 6,711,611.

Applicant points out that a supplementary amendment was made in the present case, which was filed on the same date of the mailing of this Office Action, 12/01/2005, and the two apparently passed in the US mail. The supplemental amendment canceled the original claims and presented ten new claims for examination that are believed to be patentably distinct from the original claims.

Therefore, in response to the Examiner's present office action, applicant again cancels claims 1-10 and presents the same new claims that were filed in the previously-filed supplementary amendment. Applicant also provides a general response to the references of Kikinis and Banerjee provided by the Examiner.

Applicant argues that Kikinis does not provide the level of connectivity and functionality with a communication center, to a user of the proxy server, using a light computerized device, as claimed in the present invention. Kikinis provides a proxy server for downloading data from a WEB server. Kikinis teaches that a proxy server connects to an appropriate server and accesses and downloads data. Kikinis specifically teaches the proxy server 19 acts as a proxy for computer 13, performing those functions of Web browsing computer 13 cannot perform. Applicant urges that Kikinis discloses a teaching that is specifically limited to Web browsing.

Banerjee provides a portable interface which can operate software and access data on a standalone PC. There is no suggestion in the art to provide a portable unit capable of

operating all software available at the communication center from the workstation on behalf of and according to direction from the light computerized device.

Applicant argues that the ability of the portable device to access and operate databases and functions at the communication center via an agent's workstation is only taught in applicant's specification. Banerjee makes absolutely no suggestion that the PC has access to software and/or data other than what is housed at the PC.

Applicant urges the Examiner consider applicant's remarks concerning the provided references of Kikinis and Banerjee when responding to the newly submitted claims. Applicant also believes the double patenting rejection no longer applies in view of the newly submitted claims.

If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present application and amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534, and if any time extensions such extensions are petitioned, and fees authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully submitted,
Musa Hanhan

By /Donald R. Boys/
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
831-726-1457